

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on May 5, 2005. By this response, claims 1, 7 and 8 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-8 are now active for examination.

The Office Action dated May 5, 2005 rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Ohishi (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0053956). The anticipation rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

Claim 1, as amended, describes an information providing apparatus including an information storage device that stores a plurality of different types of information to be **provided to a plurality of on-vehicle apparatuses**. The information providing apparatus further includes an interactive voice response device having a speech recognition function for providing audio guidance that is edited in advance for each user, and engaging in a dialogue with a user through an automatic voice response via a telephone line. Desired information is obtained from the information storage device based on the dialogue between the user and the interactive voice response device. The obtained information is transmitted to at least one of the plurality of on-vehicle apparatuses. Thus, an exemplary system according to claim 1 includes an information storage device, such as a database that stores a plurality of different types of information to be provided to a plurality of on-vehicle apparatuses. The system provides audio guidance that is edited in advance for each user, and transmits needed information based upon the dialogue between the user and the interactive voice response device. Since audio guidance is edited or configured in advance for each user, the user can obtain desired information simply by conducting a short dialogue with the interactive voice response device, without the need to go through many layers of menu selections to obtain the desired information. Appropriate support for the amendment can be found in, for example, Figs. 1, 4A-4F, 6 and 7; page 9, last paragraph

through page 10, first paragraph, and page 14, second paragraph through page 25, first paragraph.

On the other hand, Ohishi describes a navigation system with a voice recognition control that recognizes a predetermined vocal phrase or word from a user. The system audibly provides appropriate destination information to the user based on the user's speech. Ohishi, however, does not disclose that the navigation system includes an information storage device that stores a plurality of different types of information to be provided to a plurality of on-vehicle apparatuses, as described in claim 1.

Furthermore, although Ohishi describes a navigation system with voice recognition capability, the voice recognition in Ohishi recognizes a predetermined word from spoken utterances of a user, and suggests a destination based on the user's utterances. Ohishi does not specifically describe an interactive voice response device having a speech recognition function for providing audio guidance that is edited in advance for each user, and engaging in a dialogue with a user through an automatic voice response via a telephone line, as described in claim 1. Since the voice recognition in Ohishi's system is not edited in advance, the users needs to go through layers of menu selections to obtain the desired information. Since Ohishi fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1, Ohishi cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation. The anticipation rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 7 and 8 also include descriptions related to storing a plurality of different types of information to be provided to a plurality of on-vehicle apparatuses, and providing audio guidance that is edited in advance for each user. As discussed earlier relative to

claim 1, these features are not available in Ohishi. Consequently, claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Ohishi.

Claims 2-6, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Thus, claims 2-6 also are patentable over Ohishi by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1 as well as based on their own merits.

Applicants noted that the Office Action contended that “with regard to claim 2, the interactive voice response is edited based on information pre-registered by the user on paragraph 0050 in Ohishi et al”. However, contrary to the contention, such descriptions could **not** be found in the paragraph identified by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6 describe novel and non-obvious features that are unavailable in Ohishi. Favorable reconsideration of Ohishi is respectfully requested.

Conclusions

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ representatives listed below.

Application No.: 10/828,272

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 5, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**